20c APRIL 20, 1953

IS THE PRESS UNFAIR TO McCARTHY?

New Republic

COMMUNISTS IN THE CHURCHES

SHOULD THE CLERGY OR THE CONGRESS ACT?

LIGHTS OUT FOR PUBLIC POWER

THE ATTACK ON RURAL ELECTRIFICATION

Reviews by

MARK SCHORER — KATHLEEN RAINE

BRUNO LASKER — DUDLEY FITTS

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

APR 16 1953

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From Our Readers

McCarthy Report

● It is a well-known "fact" that when a woman's spirits are low, she needs a new hat. Well, the bonnet hasn't been designed that could cheer up this woman after she reads what Mr. McCarthy can get away with every day in the week!

Enclosed is my check for the spring hat I didn't buy. Please use it to supply a few libraries with reprints of your report on Mr. McCarthy's finances, or if you prefer, use it for your fund to continue *NR* subscriptions for small libraries that can't afford to keep them up.

By the way, the new suit I didn't buy is going into my savings account for "Stevenson in '56," and one shoe each to the Democratic National Committee and to Volunteers in Politics. I felt swell, though I undoubtedly looked dowdy, walking in Central Park on Easter in last year's suit, a three-year-old hat, six-year-old topper, and shoes, gloves, bag, etc., that were not new.

If the Senate and the President are hypnotized by Mr. McCarthy, there must be something we indignant citizens can do, if we are numerous enough and mad enough.

New York City DOROTHY T. HIRSCH

● Re: "The Financial Affairs of Joseph McCarthy," would it be possible to purchase 100 copies and have you mail them yourselves to key recipients of your own choosing? I would be willing to contribute this to a most important cause.

Ridgefield, Conn. TED SHANE

[The *New Republic* will be glad to make effective distribution of any copies of the McCarthy reprint which readers want to purchase for this purpose. – [THE EDITORS.]

● I have tried and failed to get a copy of March 30 *New Republic* containing the report on Senator McCarthy. I enclose 20 cents for two reprints of "McCarthy's Money" as advertised in your latest edition, found in our public library. All newsstand copies had been grabbed up soon after appearing on the stand. My sincere thanks to you for making this elusive report available to many people who want to know the truth about this dangerous man.

Portland, Ore. FLORENCE LAWRENCE

McCarthy and the GOP

● McCarthy accuses the "left-wing" press of trying to create a split in Republican ranks. It doesn't look like there is a split at the present time. Dulles is called a liar by McCarthy in the Bohlen case; Knowland is questioned about his integrity and the President laughs off the idea of having trouble with Joseph McCarthy. Of course, Harold Stassen looks awkward for his meek stand against Mighty Joe; but the President interpreted to the press what Stassen really meant. ("Start packing Harold, they have just dealt you out of the game.")

Ike doesn't want a showdown or he would have had one with McCarthy a few weeks ago. Truman and Acheson didn't back away from the bully.

The Voice of America has become the Voice of Joe McCarthy. Some of us are still waiting for some courageous Senator to call for a genuine investigation of the man. Otherwise in 1956, we may see the ticket of Nixon and McCarthy for the top jobs in the nation. McCarthy will have Nixon as his Vice-Presidential candidate! Nixon will complain but McCarthy shall have his way.

Walnut Creek, Calif. T. E. KENDALL

Carsun Chang

● The book review "The Third Force In China" (*NR*, March 30) gave some interesting facts. In reading Robert North's article, I gained the impression that Mr. Chang was and probably is very idealistic about the future for China. The question raised in my mind is: Can liberal forces in China (not under Nationalists) united with the government on Formosa eliminate the feudalism of the Kuomintang and bring democracy to mainland China?

It is disturbing to read that he thinks a third world war is almost inevitable. Like Mr. North, I hope Mr. Chang's wishes for China's possible democratic future are to be realized.

Cedar Rapids, Iowa F. J. MILLER

Are Political Funds O.K.?

● Now that *Look* magazine has tried Nixon, found him to be reasonably honest and, ergo, fit to be President, perhaps it is a good time to consider whether other characteristics may also be prerequisite.

As a starting point, perhaps we would be justified in seeking a modicum of maturity and self-control in our future Vice-Presidents. When one of them becomes President he should at least have these qualities.

Now that the campaign is in the limbo of the past, is it too much to ask that responsible politicians declare themselves on the practice of their being on the payroll of private (I almost said special) interests? That great question has never been satisfactorily answered.

From out of his flood of tears Mr. Nixon has never, so far as I have seen,

(Continued on page 4)

To Our Readers

● These are exciting days for the *New Republic* as we strive to become a subscriber-supported journal of opinion. From now on, this column will report our progress to our readers.

* * *

This week the major change is our business office. For twenty-seven years Dan Mebane has run that office as business manager and publisher. Behind him 154 bound volumes of the *New Republic* stand on his shelves. "They are my life," he declares, and he means it. He started as an English instructor at the University of Indiana, and he remembers the day when the President called him on the carpet for using the *New Republic* in his classroom. He came to New York, joined the Ingersoll Watch Company and gave up a comfortable career there to join the *New Republic*, in 1920, at $40 a week.

He ran the business office; but he spoke out always; the most militant and optimistic voice on the *NR*. Thousands of readers have been brought in by his confident claims printed on the back page; hundreds have been brought back when their angry letters of cancellation evoked his endearing replies.

He also managed four other magazines published by the same corporation. For purely legal reasons, that corporation has had to sever its connections with the *New Republic* and Dan, as one of its principal officers, has of necessity resigned. We miss him.

* * *

To his place, as publisher, comes Gil Harrison, a young man with an extraordinary record of achievement. As a sergeant in the South Pacific he founded the American Veterans Committee. He led the non-communists of AVC in the long fight to prevent domination by a communist caucus. He ran AVC in the lean years when a long-distance call provoked a financial crisis. He spent a year in Oxford "reading the *Economist*," and 15 months representing an American group that supported democratic organizations in Germany. He organized the World Veterans Federation that today joins 16 million veterans from 16 nations.

In him the *NR* gains a mind without grooves; an attitude of insistence on the highest standards that brings out the best in those around him; a driving will that accomplishes his objective—today to publish a journal of opinion of which this country can be proud.

* * *

M. S.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR APRIL 20, 1953

5 Communists in the Churches
An Editorial
6 Cease Fire, No Peace
7 GOP Change of Guard
7 Death for Point Four
7 Galloping Toryism
7 Water Pressures
8 Elephants, White and Otherwise
9 Mao Tse-tung—Key to Russian World Policy?
10 Is the Press Unfair to McCarthy? by Ronald May
12 Who Owned the Ocean in 1776? by Irving Brant
14 IV. Season Plunder by K. W. Hamilton
17 Literature and the Arts:
17 Saint-John Perse, *Winds*, by Kathleen Raine
18 *Botteghe Oscure X*, by Mark Schorer
19 G. M. Kahin, *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia*, by Bruno Lasker
20 Barrows Dunham, *Giant in Chains*, by Ralph G. Ross
21 *Websters New World Dictionary*, by Edward Calver
21 Mark Van Doren, *Spring Birth*, by Dudley Fitts
22 T. H. Tetens, *Germany Plots with the Kremlin*, by Jean Pajus

EDITOR, Michael Straight
CHAIRMAN, Editorial Board: Bruce Bliven
PUBLISHER: Gilbert A. Harrison
MANAGING EDITOR: Helen Fuller
LITERARY EDITOR: Robert Richman
REPORTERS: Jean Begeman, Tom Fitzsimmons, Arnold J. Heidenheimer (on leave with the Armed Services)
CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Eric Bentley, Drama Critic; Malcolm Cowley; Robert Evett, Music Critic.
CONTRIBUTING CRITICS: W. H. Auden, Dudley Fitts, Kimon Friar, Gerald Johnson, V. O. Key, Max Lerner, Richard Lester, James R. Newman, Kathleen Raine, John Crowe Ransom, Herbert Read, Mark Schorer, James Johnson Sweeney, Allen Tate, Robert Penn Warren
ADMINISTRATIVE ASSISTANT: F. R. Ruskin
COPY ASSISTANT: Lucille Davis

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1953 IN THE USA BY NEW REPUBLIC, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE, 301 N ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 1416 F ST., N.W., WASHINGTON 4, D.C. BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 230 WEST 41st ST., NEW YORK 36, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20c; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50.

WASHINGTON WIRE

As SUCCINCTLY as we know how to put it, stalemate truce in Korea would mean these new problems: (1) Korea would be left divided, which means that fanatic, heroic Syngman Rhee would be a difficulty. (2) Formosa and Chiang Kai-shek would be left orphans; all the hokum about their "reconquering China" would have to be replaced by a new batch of face-saving platitudes which would be hard for Senator Knowland. (3) Japan would face ruin; she has lost her China trade and has been kept afloat mainly by US Korean War expenditure of a billion or so annually.

These are tough problems but not insoluble. At an off-record press affair last week Dulles loosed two trial balloons: divide Korea at the narrow waist, 90 miles north of the 38th Parallel; make Formosa a ward of the UN. (Japan is just too important to let fall into the Communist orbit; we have got to support her, somehow.) When the Dulles' remarks got out, the White House in an amusing maneuver issued a technical denial which irritated part of the press but did not alter the facts at all. The thing to note is that the China Lobby has a vested interest in prolonging the war and will probably give Ike his first experience of being called "appeaser."

It's still a toss-up whether Moscow wants peace. If it really means business, it could sign the Austrian peace treaty almost overnight: it's all ready, but Moscow has stalled for years. . . . But of one thing our feeling amounts to conviction. If the Cold War slackens, defense will become an immediate orphan in Congress. Just the mere talk of truce is already hurrying this process. We sigh at the prospect. Europeans who six months ago feared we would precipitate a third world war may soon be aghast at Congressional demands to cut taxes and bring the boys home. Just as everybody hailed (and blocked) the goal of a balanced budget, so the new slogan will be to "Keep America Strong" while voting to weaken her. Good old Bob Taft has given a fine lead; he told reporters last week he did not think Soviet peace gestures should be "an excuse for the reduction of military expenses" and a minute later, without batting an eye, said $4 billion in "fat" could be sliced off the defense budget. Maybe they can; and we have no doubt that from now on every slash in defense, foreign aid and atomic weapons will be excused on the ground that it is "fat."

America would really be safer if it had a two-party press. Then we could be sure the unfolding Administration would be subjected to the antiseptic effect of sturdy criticism. The one-party press has a vested interest in Ike's success, having supported him 80 percent in the election: must they not shade editorial comment now a bit if the GOP budget is balanced at the expense of national security? Under a two-party press we would have expected greater emphasis on several incidents that have already occurred in Ike's Administration. GOP National Chairman Wes Roberts, for example, has just been thrown out on a "10 percent" influence-peddling scandal that most pro-Ike newspapers have hardly bothered to explain. Then again, because of Ike's unwise campaign pledge to hand over the federal government's untold offshore oil wealth to a few states, how can the loyal Eisenhower press now take a very active part (or even explain) the arguments against the give-away? A third instance is the preposterous Bricker constitutional amendment. Falling in behind anti-UN and isolationist leaders in the old "hate-Truman" campaign, 64 Senators plumped for this curiosity as did also the suave Mr. Dulles. Now Ike and Dulles are themselves in office and know responsibility: they oppose the Bricker amendment. How much

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

embarrassment they would have been saved if it had had vigorous opposition in the first place! Naturally the present switch is being played down in the press. So, finally, is the spectacle of the unhappy Mutual Security Administrator Harold Stassen eating his own words in condemnation of McCarthy.

We ate with three distinguished European journalists last week, and in no time at all found ourselves defending Eisenhower. Imagine our surprise! Could this be T.R.B. talking? The trouble was they were attacking Ike, we thought, for the wrong things. Our impression is that Ike has a number of credits. He is open-hearted, humble and generous; it is hard not to like him. In press conferences so far we have found him impressive. Then on the physical side there is a quality about Ike that invites the word "massive." In 40 years of sheltered military life he has not given a thought to many domestic issues upon which now he is probably more conservative than Taft. We shall never agree with him on these, but it is fair to say he is no fool, has a flexible mind for a military man and is trying terribly hard. These things, we think, can be said in Ike's behalf. Also that in foreign affairs he is an internationalist and knows intimately the lands he is talking about. These are assets of no inconsiderable value.

Ike's difficulties, on the other hand, have begun to appear early. His naïve identification of "best brains" with big business is symbolized in the personnel of his Cabinet; his faith that an American President can get on with Congress by generously sharing leadership probably dooms his Administration to little accomplishment (which is perhaps the very goal desired). Ike was so certain that his misty, evangelical election "Crusade" was worthy that he appeased McCarthy; surely the continued nobility of his motives justifies him now in further concessions? The temptation to use McCarthy in knocking off liberal Senators Kefauver, Douglas and Humphrey, up for re-election in 1954, is almost irresistible; to aid the "Crusade," that is.

Washington T.R.B.

LETTERS

(Continued from page 2)

indicated disapproval of this practice. By example set by him we can only infer that he does approve until he states an opposite view. Nor have any Congressmen, with certain notable exceptions, declared themselves on this practice. . . .

There are many groups in this country which would like this question answered. If the practice is an acceptable one, it has already been demonstrated that business interests are willing to pay the Senator whom they can trust to vote "right." There are doubtless many other interests that would like to put a Senator on their payroll as an added bit of insurance that he will keep voting "right." . . .

Prairie Village, Kan. PAUL TILFORD

Viereckiana

● Ann Weaver is 50 percent right and 50 percent wrong in her remarks on Mr. Viereck's thinking and writing. He is undoubtedly a gifted poet—not too obscure and not very original, but certainly not a mere imitator. He has things to say in true verse.

On the other hand, in his essays on matters political, social and ethical he is pretentious and paradoxical. He seems determined to appear highly original, and this ambition is misdirected. His "neo-conservatism" is largely a fake. He is proud of his intellectual descent from Edmund Burke, and Burke was a Tory. Today Burke is irrelevant, immaterial and obsolete. We liberals and evolutionary, constitutional radicals prefer Thomas Paine, who answered Burke and demolished his philosophy.

Viereck is the founder of a new party, it would seem, but has not up to date managed to obtain followers. At this rate of recruiting, the new party may not nominate a national ticket till 2200. We are not worried by that possibility, we unrepentant new-dealers and Keynesians.

La Jolla, Calif. VICTOR S. YARROS

Bandwagon

Winter in the Trenches

In Cleveland, Humphrey and his wife played a social role proper to a leading family—but as quietly as possible. In Washington, society reporters have found Mrs. Humphrey braced for the exacting Cabinet social game. If this means cutting down on the quail shooting both enjoy on their Thomasville (Ga.) estate, that's part of the price.

It's what Humphrey calls accepting the facts of life. . . .—*From* Business Week.

Hard Days for Royalty

"Miss Safety Queen of 1952" swung into court on crutches today and pleaded guilty of passing a red light, driving without a license and driving the wrong way on a one-way street.—*From a UP dispatch.*

Our readers are invited to contribute; $2 will be paid for each item used. Address Bandwagon, c/o New Republic. Please enclose the original clipping. – The Editors.

THE FINANCIAL AFFAIRS OF McCARTHY

The Government Issued 2,500 copies.

The *NEW REPUBLIC* has sold 80,000—

Buy and circulate this "Report That Nobody Knows" to your friends, your organization, your community. Now is the time for a final assault on McCarthyism which threatens the Eisenhower Administration as dangerously as it did that of Mr. Truman.

REPRINT PRICES: Single copy—10c; 100 to 1000—$6 per hundred; 1000 to 5000—$50 per thousand; 5000 to 10,000—$40 per thousand; 10,000 or more—$30 per thousand. All prices include postage or express.

NEW REPUBLIC • 1416 F Street, N. W., Washington 4, D. C.

☐ For the enclosed $..... please send me postpaid ..... copies of the 16-page reprint of "McCarthy's Money."

Name.....

Address.....

City..... Zone..... State.....

4-20-53

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOLUME 128, NUMBER 16, ISSUE 2003, WASHINGTON, D. C., APRIL 20, 1953

New Republic

COMMUNISTS IN THE CHURCHES

THOU *shalt not bear false witness*. . . . The Eighth Commandment surely binds the minister above all others. Yet eight ministers in the Boston area were underground agents of the Communist Party in 1949, according to the sworn, and so far secret, testimony of a Congressional witness. We may question the motives of Congressional committees in exploiting this testimony. We cannot, after careful review, question the word of the witness, Herbert Philbrick. While the committees debate next steps, churches and congregations must face harsh facts.

Philbrick had no doubts about the men he named. A Baptist himself, he was promoted by the Communist Party as a leader of religious youth and knew the Communist ministers as members of his own cell, or of the underground cells of Boston. Some members of these cells might today assert that as journalists or doctors they were compelled to hide their political affiliations. And citizens who deplore the present temper of intolerance might sense some fleeting sympathy for this rationalization. But teachers who claim this moral protection deserve less sympathy, and ministers, none. In the days when academic freedom was assured, and freedom of the pulpit unchallenged, they chose deception in order to gain the benefits of conspiracy.

Philbrick declares that the ministers known to him as Communist Party members were not converted after ordination; they were selected by the Communist Party for theological training in order that they might do the party's work in the churches. To undertake this assignment seems to us as grave a moral surrender as any we can conceive; we cite just four reasons.

First, the minister alone of men commands the divine. His place is set apart from all others by the sacrifices of Christ and with that unique distinction goes unique authority and unique responsibility.

Secondly, the minister is given access to the most sacred matters in the lives of his congregation. One who is subject to Communist Party discipline is tempted if not directed to use the confessional for coercion or even blackmail.

Thirdly, the Communist Party minister violates the fundamental teachings of the institution which provides him robes and a pulpit. Conscience may lead a minister to advocate openly some of the social doctrine of Communism but in accepting uncritically all the doctrines of the Communist Party, as party members must, the minister denies the creed by which he is bound. And those churches which hold no binding creed are committed to unconditional freedom of conscience which a man utterly expends on joining the Communist Party.

Lastly, the minister is freer than any citizen from censure and review. Other suspects may seek refuge in the Fifth Amendment; the minister can draw his robes around him. Moreover the churches, unlike other voluntary associations, find it difficult to deal with conspirators.

The powers of churches with strong administrative officials or bodies, such as bishops or presbyteries, are able to act to remove ministers with a varying amount of freedom, a freedom considerably less in the Protestant communions than in the Catholic Church. A case in point is the failure by his bishop to remove the Rev. William Howard Melish from his pulpit. In the churches of congregational polity—the Unitarians, Baptists, Congregationalists, Universalists, Disciples of Christ and others—church authorities have no power to move between a minister and his congregation. For example the Fellowship Committee of the Unitarians certifies to the competence of ministerial candidates. But the local congregation alone can install and remove a minister.

Bishop Francis J. McConnell was fond of saying, "If a Methodist minister should stand up in the pulpit and say: *There is no God!* We could not remove him. But he might find that his collections were falling off!" That is true, although action to remove a minister in a large city can be made much harder by the simple expedient of all local Communists and sympathizers registering as nominal members of the congregation.

If the facts are published, it is safe to assume that the old solvents of democracy will work in time. Unfortunately the old churches have found it extremely difficult to obtain the facts. Charges of participation by ministers in Communist fronts have seemed insufficient to many congregations. Charges of Communist Party membership are met with indignant denials and have been impossible to substantiate without the assistance of the government. Yet the government for its own reasons has declined to co-operate. So the churches falter, and are accused in turn of harboring conspirators.

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
Johnson City, Tennessee

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The abuses of Congressional power and the evils of Congressional irresponsibility were demonstrated when Rep. Donald L. Jackson (R, Calif.) defended his colleague, Rep. Harold H. Velde (R, Ill.), for his proposed investigation of subversion in the churches. Jackson attacked, not the agents identified by Philbrick, but G. Bromley Oxnam, Methodist Bishop of Washington. "Bishop Oxnam has been to the Communist front what Man of War was to thoroughbred racing," Jackson cried. He damned Oxnam, (with immunity) as a man who "served God on Sunday and the Communist front for the balance of the week."

Jackson offered to make available to anyone "Bishop Oxnam's record of aid and comfort to the Communist front." The request was made, and promptly Jackson withdrew his offer declaring that it was "very voluminous . . . and much too lengthy." However, the *dossier* was obtained by the Washington *Post*. Oxnam summarized its 305 typewritten lines:

> Sixteen [lines] are a summary of the organizations mentioned in the report.
>
> One hundred and twenty-eight concern organizations never listed as subversive. . . .
>
> Seventy-two are from an obscure newspaper in Princeton, Ill., the utter falsity of which might have been disclosed in half an hour's conversation. . . .
>
> Sixty-four are devoted to organizations which I never belonged to.
>
> Twenty-three refer to organizations listed as Communist fronts to which I once belonged but from which I had resigned prior to publication of the Attorney General list. . . .

Oxnam is not under attack as a Communist sympathizer. He fought the menace of the United Front in 1935 when the professional patriots of today were busy elsewhere. He is under attack as a militant church leader, and for his enemies, Communism is merely the means of arousing animal instincts among ignorant men.

This is no time either to arouse hatred, or to refuse to face facts. Congress has the right to investigate subversion in the churches in its general inquiry into the activities of the Communist Party. Congress has the right to ask, and the churches the duty to see to it, that a handful of dishonorable men do not bring discredit on an institution fundamental in our lives. In turn the churches and the nation must insist that on an issue of this gravity, Congressional inquiry is not governed by malice, irresponsibility or political gain.

If, by subversion, a minister violates the laws of citizenship, that is a matter for government action. If by Communist Party activity he violates the creed he claims to speak for, that is a matter between himself and his church. Since evidence is lacking, we believe that Philbrick and other responsible witnesses should be freed to present their evidence first before the competent church authorities. The churches should then be given time to weigh the evidence and to act. No minister charged with Communism should take refuge in the sanctity of the confessional as did the Rev. Stephen Fritchman of Los Angeles. And no other minister, fearful of false charges or suspicions, should cease struggling, according to the dictates of his own conscience, for civil liberty, social justice and peace. The churches are the final bulwark of freedom. They failed in Germany. They have been weak in America. Action to remove the tiny group of Communist infiltrators should be the first step for the churches in asserting their competence, and the incompetence of government in matters of conscience.

THE WEEK

CEASE FIRE, NO PEACE

The prospects of a cease fire in Korea grew nearer last week, as agreement on the exchange of prisoners was completed. The prospects of peace were set back.

First, Secretary Dulles outlined to a small group of correspondents his concept of peace—a division of Korea at the waist, a trusteeship for Formosa. These conditions, involving a Communist withdrawal from present battle lines would have been hard in any case to win. But Dulles' approach was repudiated by Eisenhower and condemned by Senator Knowland; ridiculed by the Chinese Nationalists and vetoed by Syngman Rhee and Senator Taft. The prospect now is that if the firing is silenced the armies will remain.

Was any settlement possible in the Pacific prior to a settlement in Europe? So far, the Russian peace offensive has shown up in Europe only in tiny relaxations of controls. All Russian talk of unification and peace for Germany is still at the level of propaganda alone.

The West cannot accept the unification of Germany without free elections, the return of war prisoners and the abandonment of Soviet ownership of industry in the Eastern Zone. And we cannot now agree that a unified sovereign Germany should be neutralized. If Germany is to be free to join the UN then she must be free, under Articles 51 and 52 of the Charter, to join NATO. It seems inconceivable that the Russians will take that risk.

Today experts believe a repetition of the Palais Rose conference, with no agenda and no will to agree, would delay the European Army and achieve no good. The NATO nations are ready for negotiations but they will meet only to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

consider a stated and realistic agenda. The place to start they believe is the Austrian treaty. After 260 sessions only five articles of the treaty remain to be concluded. If the Kremlin really wants progress toward peace, the Austrian treaty can be concluded in the shortest time.

GOP CHANGE OF GUARD

With as little fanfare as possible, the Republican high command moved ex-Rep. Leonard Hall into former Chairman Wes Roberts' office with a prayer that the term "10 percenter" would never again echo in GOP headquarters.

Like Roberts, Hall was an early Eisenhower booster. He was manager of the Presidential campaign train and, in that capacity, has been credited with formulating the three principal back-platform issues on which Eisenhower rode to victory—Socialism, ending the Korean War and corruption. Appointed Judge of the N. Y. Surrogate Court after 12 years of service in the House, Hall was pushed by his close friend, Speaker Joseph Martin, as an ideal candidate for Roberts' job, since the GOP goal in 1954 is to strengthen its majority in Congress. Although Senator Taft would have preferred a Midwesterner to a New Yorker, the need for a show of unity at this particular time took precedence over all else. The recent splits within the ranks of the GOP over Ambassador to Moscow Charles Bohlen, reduction of taxes, the impropriety of firing Bureau of Standards Director Allen Astin, and patronage plums—had prompted the Democrats to remark that the new Administration has not only stumbled, but Republican feet have tripped it.

Politically, Hall stands closer to Senator Taft than to Eisenhower. His voting record in the House from 1939 to 1952 shows him to be in direct opposition to many of the announced stands of the President. Contrary to the President's sweeping promises to promote trade and build a strong defense here and abroad, Hall voted to kill the reciprocal trade program in 1948, to eliminate Point Four in 1950, cut defense spending of 1953 and to reduce military aid to Europe.

DEATH FOR POINT FOUR

Republicans and Democrats hailed the Point Four program as America's one long-range effort to abolish the causes of war. Farsighted businessmen understood that the expansion of Point Four alone could take up the slack in armaments expenditures and so fulfill President Eisenhower's promise to keep the US fully employed. But on March 18 Secretary Dulles, after deploring the dangers of Communism in the Near East and Asia stated that the Point Four program would be abandoned, leaving overseas development to private companies and philanthropic groups such as the Rockefeller Foundation.

Ironically it was Nelson Rockefeller, as chairman of the International Development Advisory Board who reported that the Point Four program "must be considered a vital part of our own defense mobilization." If Dulles prevails, 1,500 Americans engaged in Point Four work in 35 countries will be called home. In contrast to the $300 million appropriated by Congress (an amount held by the Rockefeller Commission to be one-half the needed sum), Rockefeller Foundation expenditures on less-developed countries has been $1 million per year.

GALLOPING TORYISM

Herbert Hoover, speaking in Cleveland, wrote *Amen* to the charge in this week's issue that a major attack on public power is shaping up. He declared that government should sell only falling water to private concerns, that no new projects designed solely for power should be built, and that existing projects should be turned over to private utilities. These he commended for reducing rates to one-third of the levels of 20 years ago, never hinting that the yardstick of public power had brought the rates down. Low rates were his proposed target, and, conceding that rates might rise, he declared that regulation could well take care of the consumers.

The reason for the sale, he declared, was creeping Socialism. But then, police compete with private eyes, public schools with private schools, the tax collector with the bill collector. The Emperor of Abyssinia recently sold the franchise of his nation's free press to a palace favorite for a handsome sum. We wait for the recommendation that all government functions be sold, on a closed bid, to one of the many excellent management consultant firms that helped write the Hoover report.

WATER PRESSURES

The St. Lawrence Seaway, one piece of forward-looking legislation which was believed to have a chance of passage in this session of Congress, may be falling a victim of private-interest pressures on a pliable President.

White House Press Secretary James C. Hagerty has now confirmed reports of a heretofore secret meeting on March 29 between top railroad executives and President Eisenhower. Hagerty refused to say whether the President changed his opinion of the waterway following the meetings but supporters of the project are fearful that he has. Among opponents of the waterway known to have attended the private supper party with the President were William T. Faricy, president of the Association of American Railroads, Fred G. Gurley, president of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fe Railroad, and Walter S. Franklin, president of the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Several days after the meeting Sen. Alexander Wiley (R, Wis.) announced that he was authorized to state that Eisenhower favored New York State participation in the building of hydroelectric dams on the St. Lawrence with the province of Ontario. In addition, Wiley repeated the chief executive's press conference statement of March 19 that he would consider it unfortunate if Canada built the seaway alone without help from the United States. The mildness of the statement, reported by a strong advocate of seaway legislation, left the unmistakable impression that the secret meeting had taken its toll. Wiley refused to amplify the President's declaration but added: "I can only state that the President said he was studying my bill and that some of its opponents had given him their views on it. I still feel that he will support us when he gets the real facts. . . ."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ELEPHANTS, WHITE AND OTHERWISE

SEN. JOHN W. BRICKER (R, Ohio) wishes to amend the Constitution of the United States in a manner which he claims will prevent treaties from negating the Bill of Rights. His proposal also bars control by an international organization of any matter "essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the US" and requires that a treaty once ratified by the Senate must be passed by a majority of both Houses. The amendment, says Sen. Everett M. Dirksen (R, Ill), would be a safe-guard against the "fanciful brains" of our delegates to the UN and other international bodies and, the implication is plain, of our Presidents.

This kind of commendable concern for the rights of Americans was shared by delegates to an early form of international body—the Constitutional Convention of 1787. Those delegates created a Constitution including provisions under which a treaty, once ratified by two-thirds of the Senate, becomes the "supreme law of the land," which is a way of saying that no *state law* is permitted to contravene a contract entered into by the nation as a whole just as no state law may contravene the US Constitution or federal laws enacted under its authority. Some of the delegates to that Convention also worried about "fanciful brains," and tried to weaken those as well as other provisions for a strong executive. But finally the idea that we were one nation and not 13 prevailed.

Since the treaty provisions were written, their clear intent has been upheld time and time again by Supreme Court rulings that treaties cannot override the Constitution. And, as Attorney General Herbert Brownell Jr. recently informed the Senate Judiciary Committee, those rulings combined with the constitutional checks and balances of two-thirds of the Senate on the President in treaty-making, of the Congress on both in erasing, by simply passing a law, any undesired domestic effects, and of the courts on all in judging the constitutionality of the results, add up to as strong a legal guarantee against abuse of power as the ingenuity of man ever devised.

As for the other parts of Bricker's proposal—we must be free to maintain existing international control over narcotics, quarantine regulations, postal regulations, aviation, etc., and eventually to negotiate control of atomic energy. Requiring a treaty to pass both Houses, once it has been ratified by the Senate is absurd; a similar provision was rejected by the Constitutional Convention.

So the Bricker proposal is, at best, a redundant measure, and one inferior to the original because it moves in to destroy the balance-of-power concept so carefully woven into our Constitution over 160 years ago. The best that can be said for it is that it seeks to protect the rights of citizens in the event that a US President and two-thirds of the US Senate should be determined to subvert our Constitution. Yet since anyone determined to throw out the first 22 articles of the Constitution would obviously not hesitate to throw out Bricker's proposed 23, its real intent is probably something else. The foreign-policy voting record of Bricker, Dirksen and the other hard-core supporters of the proposal might indicate that real intent, as might Bricker's statement that the UN suffers from "an insatiable lust for power" and is "destined for an early demise."

Although it bore the names of 64 Senators, the shortcomings of the Bricker proposal caused it to die quietly in committee when first introduced in 1952. Yet, when it was reintroduced this year with but minor changes to cloak its more blatant incongruities, the Republican Administration felt compelled to offer the isolationist sponsors a bribe. This despite the fact that many of the original 56 backed the proposal for vote-getting reasons only, were not consulted before their names were tacked onto the modified version reintroduced after the election, and would probably have responded to persuasion from the White House.

But the Administration had compromised itself on this issue as it has on so many others. In his pre-responsibility days, John Foster Dulles, criticizing the Democratic Administration last year, said that treaty law "can cut across rights given to the people by the . . . Bill of Rights." That statement was exploited by the Bricker element in his party and, when he appeared to testify against the proposal, Dulles found himself embarrassed. A study of the facts had changed his opinion, he said. But the modicum of courage needed to let it go at that seemed to be lacking. So the bribe: the Secretary of State solemnly promised that the US would not sign the covenant on human rights now being drafted by the UN, or the convention on political rights of women, or the genocide convention, both already passed by the UN and awaiting ratification by individual nations.

The principles incorporated in these three conventions were approved by the majority of the United Nations—that is their value. We led the fight for that approval. We would gain nothing by signing the first two since they represent minimums far below our own established standards. But we would have gained a very great deal by not abdicating leadership in the struggle to have them adopted by nations to which they would prove substantial gains. By turning his back on those nations as a bribe to the most reactionary clique in his party, John Foster Dulles and the President he spoke for have so abdicated. And those people throughout the world who saw in Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt's never-ceasing efforts a proof that US concern for human rights everywhere was not just a tactic in the power struggle, but a sincere ideal, are, in the words of a UN delegate from India, "depressed and discouraged."

TOM FITZSIMMONS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MAO TSE-TUNG — KEY TO RUSSIAN WORLD POLICY?

DOES THE Russian good-will offensive mean a change only in tactics, or is basic policy involved? The more Moscow offers what seems to be evidence of something like sweetness and light the greater the disagreement on the answer. Moreover the efforts to interpret the new version of the peace offensive have led to an oddly ill-assorted line-up of agreement within the disagreement.

On one side, accepting (for differing reasons) the new line as a continuation in a revised tactical form of Marshal Stalin's long-term strategy are officials of most of the Western European countries, of the US State Department *and also* of Communist parties outside the Iron Curtain. On the other side, suggesting (also for differing reasons) a real break with the whole Stalinist pattern of policy are leading experts and newspapers both of the Left and of the Right in Western Europe *and also* the men who are writing the Kremlin's communiques as well as those who speak for Peking.

The *Humanité* of Paris, official newspaper of the French Communist Party, and a dozen other CP organs in cities from Sweden to Sicily have echoed in one form or another during the last few weeks the pronouncement of the East German *Neues Deutschland* that the changes in Moscow "are merely a continuation" of Stalin's policy. French Premier René Mayer, Secretary of State Dulles and spokesmen for Bonn and Rome have said much the same thing.

On the other hand, the omission of Stalin's name from important editorials in the *Pravda* and *Izvestia* of Moscow has been glaringly apparent. Retroactive criticism of him in the Soviet Union has been obvious. The *Monde* of Paris, both of the Right and neutralist, said that if the Soviet Union persisted in following the path it had chosen, it might "contribute toward creating a moral rapprochement between the two opposing camps and fully validate the principle of peaceful co-existence." Even the *Figaro*, voice of the big business Right, and as anti-Communist as the Hearst-McCormick press, has said that "Russia may be passing from the stage of 'authoritarian empire' to that of 'liberal empire'."

The major conservative English newspapers have gone even farther. A view which has been more widely quoted all over Western Europe than any other on the new peace offensive was that of the *Observer:* " . . . All the developments indicate that we are dealing with a new government in Russia which should not be automatically identified with the Stalin regime, and which ought to be judged anew." The right attitude for the West, says the *Observer*, is "one of open-minded and unprejudiced circumspection."

No one in Europe believes that the Eisenhower "line" has forced (or even greatly influenced) Malenkov toward his apparent repudiation of much of the Stalinist past. Nor is there any longer much belief that the Moscow reorientation reflects a back-stage struggle for personal power in the Kremlin. Such a struggle may of course be going on, but Western European opinion has been shifting toward the notion that the change results from a new arrangement or a new relation of power between Russia and China. An Asiatic, Stalin might have been assumed the leader of the Russian equivalent of the Asia-firsters. In fact Malenkov had that role, as against Zhdanov who as sponsor of the Cominform was head of the Europe-firsters. Stalin, jealous of Mao Tse-tung, tended both to underestimate him and also to work against the full success of Chinese Communism. It is on the record that Stalin went far toward preferring Chiang Kai-shek to Mao as the leader of the Chinese people.

Malenkov never made such a mistake. He saw Russia's destiny linked with that of Mao's China. Now it seems to many thoughtful Western Europeans that the real heir to Stalin, the real inspirer of the new Moscow line, is not Malenkov or Beria or any other Russian: he is none other than Mao Tse-tung. And it is also on the record that Mao is the only Communist leader of world stature outside Russia (or within, for that matter) who has dared to disagree with Stalin on major doctrine, dogma and even practice, and who, nevertheless, has won his point without losing his position.

Commenting on the important directive on land collectivization just issued by the Chinese Communist Party's Central Committee, the extremely well-informed Hong Kong correspondent of the London *Times* said: "It was in leadership of the peasants that the Chinese Communist Party first broke with the strict Marxian doctrine, and it is still in its work among the peasants that the party tempers doctrine with experience and common sense. The unwritten admission which runs through the directive is that collectivization is a long way off.

Malenkov's equivalent of this common sense may be his constant invocation of the facts as they may be visible to thoughtful people everywhere—each statement of any importance from Moscow now refers to the intelligentsia as well as workers and farmers. And it seems to many Western Europeans that with Mao in the ideological driver's seat, Malenkov may be trying to replace Stalin's Socialism in one country by planned industrialization of the whole Eurasian "heartland" of the geopoliticians with its 800 million people.

Trade with the free world becomes, therefore, a primary need, reflecting, as the *Economist* points out, the "recognition that goods from the West are a vital necessity if the Communist orbit, including China, is to be industrialized according to plan." And "if Russia's new rulers contemplate radical reforms at home, they must think of a possible *detente* on the international front."

Paris FRANK GORRELL

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IS THE PRESS UNFAIR TO McCARTHY?

by Ronald May

ON APRIL 5, 1953, 700 newspaper editors received a protest from 28 publicists, charging that Sen. Joseph McCarthy was treated unfairly by the press. The signers included Felix Morley and Fulton Lewis Jr., John T. Flynn and John Chamberlain. They asserted: "Some of our colleagues in newspapers, magazines, on the radio and TV have enjoyed a virtually unchallenged forum of loose talk on the subject of McCarthyism. We feel they owe their readers, their listeners and their consciences an accounting."

Why not? An accounting might well start with press coverage which, surveys show, was weighted heavily against Democratic candidates in the 1952 campaign. During the first two weeks of March, 1953, McCarthy's name appeared 17 times in the headlines of the critical New York *Times* as compared to 27 references to President Eisenhower and 17 for Senator Taft. The friendly Chicago *Tribune*, during the same two weeks, gave McCarthy and Eisenhower 12 headlines each, and Taft only five. The majority of US newspapers give no less space than the *Times* to McCarthy. In the same week in which McCarthy's friends issued their protest he was the subject of four full and separate stories in *Time*. Since he is neither a member of the executive, nor of the legislative high command, he is certainly not ignored.

Are the headlines slanted against McCarthy? Certainly they vary widely. The variations follow the confusion of fact and fiction which McCarthy weaves. For example, in 1950, when the State Department first called on McCarthy to back up his charges with facts, the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch* read: "Put Up Or Shut Up McCarthy Is Told By State Department."

But the Chicago *Tribune*, ignoring the State Department entirely, reported only McCarthy's comment on the same story under the headline: "Set Up Drive To Expose Reds In Government. Senator McCarthy To Bare New Security Risk."

Three years later, when McCarthy lunched with Secretary Dulles to discuss the Greek ships, the New York *Times* headline indicated a retreat by McCarthy: "McCarthy Assures Dulles He'll Give Data On Ship Deals."

The Wisconsin *State Journal* indicated good will on both sides: "McCarthy Promises Assistance To Dulles."

The Chicago *Tribune* saw victory for the "fighting Senator." "Dulles Thanks McCarthy For Red Trade Curbs."

When McCarthy at Wheeling, W. Va., first accused the State Department of harboring Communists, the press at once sought confirmation. On McCarthy's return from Wheeling reporters asked to see the lists of Communists in the State Department which he claimed to possess. "Of course," he answered, rummaging through his briefcase as flash bulbs popped. Then, surprised and apologetic, he explained that the list was packed in his luggage on the plane. So McCarthy's technique emerged. Yet the majority of conservative papers, such as Hearst's New York *Journal American* took McCarthy at his word in banner headlines that asserted: "McCarthy To List State Department Reds."

As the Senate hearings opened, responsible papers such as the San Francisco *Chronicle* and the New York *Times* printed factual headlines and gave equal space to accusations and replies. In contrast, on March 13, 1950, the Chicago *Tribune* headlined the unsupported assertion: "Evidence Floods Red Quiz."

The New York *Journal American's* news story of March 14 was headed: "Red Probe Backfired On Democrats."

A second news story in the *Journal American* stated of Judge Dorothy Kenyon, the first to be named, "Kenyon Faces Accuser Today." But no word of Judge Kenyon's defense, which demolished the accusation, appeared in the *Journal American*.

The disadvantage of the press in dealing with McCarthy was shown further on the Greek ship deal. Even Hearst had turned on McCarthy for his campaign against Charles Bohlen when the Senator called a press conference to announce the completion of an agreement with the Greek ship owners. The press conference was called late on Saturday afternoon, too late for reporters to check on the lengthy negotiations carried on with the shipowners by the Administration, but just in time to make Sunday's headlines. Accepting McCarthy's version at face value, the New York *Times* headline read: "Greek Ship Owners To Stop Red Trade."

The Ashland (Wisconsin) *Daily Press* carried a double banner head: "Senator McCarthy Strikes Heaviest Blow At Communism In This Generation; Halts Red Trade Of 242 Ships."

An example of press coverage on a minor story concerned myself. As the guest of John Zabel, McCarthy's former law partner, I attended a banquet at the Schroeder

Ronald May is the co-author with Jack Anderson of the book McCarthy the Man, the Senator, the "Ism."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Hotel at which McCarthy spoke. He asserted in his speech that he was constantly harassed by "spies" for Communists, Democrats and Drew Pearson and declared that one of these spies was present. He aroused such feeling against this "spy" that the audience soon resembled a mob. Then he named myself, and dared me to stand up. I stood up, and pandemonium broke loose. A woman grasped my arm screaming, "Why don't you fight for America!" I answered that I had spent four years in the Navy. I was blocked at the podium by one of McCarthy's bodyguards. To reporters gathered outside I explained my work and my presence at the meeting.

The Milwaukee *Journal* and the Madison *Capital Times* reported the incident fairly, in the small space it deserved. But Hearst's Milwaukee *Sentinel* ran a headline: **"McCarthy Points Finger At Snooper; Charges He Is Seeking Smear Material."**

The story which followed declared that I had refused to discuss my book with reporters or to answer the Senator before a hostile crowd. Both statements were untrue, and I carried my denial to the *Sentinel*. It printed a four-inch item headed: **"Denies Spying On McCarthy."**

The truth is that McCarthy has received far more press coverage than the significance of his actions and charges deserve.

One reason, of course, is that McCarthy learned long ago how headlines are made. He was trained, when, as a young lawyer in Shawano, Wis., he ran for district attorney. McCarthy campaigned on the issues as a New Deal Democrat. His opponent accused local officials of permitting houses of prostitution to flourish in the county. McCarthy was badly beaten, but he learned. He opened his next campaign, for circuit judge, by charging that the elderly incumbent, his chief opponent, had lied about his age and was older than he admitted. So he made the headlines and won. He made further headlines by becoming the youngest circuit judge in Wisconsin's history, a feat accomplished by subtracting one year from his own age.

So McCarthy's technique developed. Other candidates for office with military records criticized their opponents in 1946 for being civilians. McCarthy made headlines by accusing his 1946 opponent, Sen. Robert LaFollette, of making a fortune in the war while other Americans fought, bled and died. Other Senators, newly arrived in Washington, criticized labor for striking. McCarthy, on arriving, made headlines by accusing the miners of near-treason and demanding that they and their leader, John L. Lewis, be drafted into the Army. Other Senators criticized the performance of Francis P. Matthews as Secretary of the Navy. McCarthy earned headlines by demanding that he be "impeached" for disloyalty to the Navy, untruthfulness and "complete incompetence." Other Republicans cautioned against Communist sympathizers in the State Department; McCarthy broke into the clear as a headliner by declaring that the Department harbored 205 card-carrying Communist Party members.

McCarthy compelled press coverage by his extravagant and sensational charges. He gained more favorable treatment than he deserved by his method, as calculated as an opening in chess.

Thus McCarthy charges an official with being a pro-Communist. The official denies the charge. The denial itself is as damaging as if the press carried the headline: **"McCarthy Denies Peddling Dope To Teen Agers"**; the name and the charge are out, to be mingled in millions of minds. However, if the official defends himself, McCarthy moves up his major pieces: The proof of treachery is in the secret files! The official is speechless; how can he disprove this assertion? He calls weakly for an inspection of the files. If then the files are opened to qualified persons and the charges are disproved, McCarthy brings up his queen. The files have been stripped by the pro-Communists in the State Department! Checkmate! The official staring at the board, sees he is cornered and beaten. There is nothing more that he can do.

When McCarthy himself is challenged his method, which so few have understood, is never to defend himself, but always to counterattack. Once again, in its effort to be impartial, the press falls into his hands. When Senator Benton moves to investigate his finances, McCarthy offers no defense, but floods the press with charges of Benton's Communist connections. When Francis Biddle, chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, presses the Attorney General to look further into McCarthy's finances, McCarthy ensures simply that the newspapers include in the story his identification of the ADA as a Communist conspiracy. When Dr. George Shuster, President of Hunter College, calls for a new investigation of McCarthy, the Senator condemns Hunter College for tolerating Communists on its faculty. From that time on, all that is heard from Shuster is his explanation of how McCarthy's targets came to be employed.

So the press conveys to 30 million readers the conclusion that only Communists and Communist sympathizers oppose McCarthy in his campaign to save America.

What can the press do? Its standards, unique throughout the world, have been built on an insistence on objective reporting. No other principle is possible, and yet, under pressure of McCarthy's methods, objective reporting serves simply as a transmission belt for outrageous falsehood. Is a newspaper being objective when it headlines a statement made on the Senate floor which the editor knows to be false? Is it being objective when it reports fully a sensational charge, because it is sensational,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and hardly mentions a documented reply, which is and must be comparatively dull? Houston Waring, editor of the Littleton Colorado *Independent* spent one day in March, 1951, watching the reams of copy about McCarthy's charges flow into his office on the press service wire. Then he wrote:

> For decades the American press has worshipped the God of objectivity. This seemed to keep the voters informed on all sides of a question until the invention of the technique of the big lie. Under this technique a public official can use totalitarian methods—knowing his utterances will be reported straight and that the truth will never catch up with his falsehoods.
>
> This is happening, and when it happens the genius of our civilization, our radios, televisions, high-speed presses and airmail deliveries, is directed to giving the widest possible distribution to the big lie in the shortest possible time.
>
> Our editors sense this danger. Some, in self-protection, state the facts parenthetically in news stories when these stories convey falsehoods. Others play down stories that carry flagrant untruths. Yet few present to readers the underlying conditions against which McCarthy's fragmentary charges can be judged. Those columnists and commentators who attempt this service are now threatened with attack themselves as the perpetrators of "loose talk" on McCarthy.

An attack on McCarthy's critics in the press has been broached over and over. McCarthy himself condemned the "high pitched squealing of those left-wing bleeding hearts of the press and radio" as long ago as January, 1951. Two months later he told the Senate: "Those camp followers in press, radio and motion pictures have done deadly damage to this nation in aiding the conspiracy of the three active Communist divisions at work in America."

McCarthy had identified the "Communist" camp followers; they are Drew Pearson, William T. Evjue and many others. He has identified the Communist-minded newspapers; they include the Washington *Post* and the St. Louis *Post-Dispatch*. The Milwaukee *Journal*, he has charged, distorts its news along Communist lines and "deliberately and grossly prostitutes the freedom of the press." He has sought to punish the nation's top newsmen, including Marvin Arrowsmith, Jack Dell, John Steele, Martin Agronsky and Ben Grauer, and the top publishers including Henry Luce. Regrettably he is not alone. Senator Taft and Senator Smathers have lent their weight to McCarthy's effort to silence liberal columnists and commentators; Representative Velde has implied that they are legitimate targets for investigation. Our free press will survive the comments of Morley and Flynn; but the pressures are on.

WHO OWNED THE OCEAN IN 1776?

by Irving Brant

DEFENDERS of the off-shore oil grab are saying a lot these days about the "historic rights of the states" to the waters abutting on their shores. Not content with jurisdiction down to the low-tide mark, they claim that the sovereignty of the separate states extends out to sea three miles, or 10 miles, or to the edge of the continental shelf, and if there were any oil in the Mindanao Deep they would be claiming that.

The Supreme Court, to be sure, has ruled three times that everything beyond low tide belongs to the nation as a whole—to the American people—not to a few individual states. This is displeasing to oil companies which find it easy to deal with state governments. So they are proceeding to reverse the Supreme Court, not by adding new members to it, but by passing an Act of Congress which will give the oil companies the property of the nation.

Of course, the oil-dripping Senators and Representatives don't put it that way. They say, in effect, that the Supreme Court is a bunch of legal palookas enlarging the perverted nationalism of Chief Justice Marshall, whereas they—the Congressmen—are going back to pure and pristine American principles. They stand on the sacred, God-given inheritance of state sovereignty wrested from George III, bought from Napoleon Bonaparte or derived by hemophilic osmosis from the Spanish Bourbons.

All right, let's go back to the beginning of this republic and see what the people who created it thought about this "historic right" of the individual states to the open ocean bordering their shores. Here is a resolution adopted by the Continental Congress on March 23, 1776, one year after the Revolutionary War broke out and three months before the Declaration of Independence was adopted:

> That all vessels . . . and cargoes belonging to the inhabitants of Great Britain . . . which shall happen to be taken NEAR THE SHORES of any of these colonies, by the people of the country, or detachments from the army, shall be deemed lawful prize, and the COURT OF ADMIRALTY WITHIN THE SAID COLONY IS REQUIRED, on condemnation thereof [to divide the prize money equally].

Irving Brant is now completing the fourth and next to the last volume of his Life of Madison, which will be published in the fall.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That resolution and others like it had the force of national law, as anybody knows who has read Marshall's opinion in the *Olmstead Case*. It contains one possible loophole for the oil-grabbers. The Atlantic Ocean is three thousand miles wide. Perhaps "near the shores" meant more than three miles out, though it is hard to see how "detachments of the army" could wade that far. That question was answered on April 2, 1776, when Congress adopted a commission for privateers, authorizing them to capture ships "on the high seas, *or between high- and low-water marks.*" The identical scope of these actions was made plainer in a supplemental resolution adopted by the Continental Congress on July 24, 1776:

Resolved, That all the resolutions of this Congress, passed on the 23rd day of March last [and later] . . . relating to [British] ships . . . TAKEN ON THE HIGH SEAS, OR BETWEEN HIGH- AND LOW-WATER MARK, be extended to all ships [owned by non-revolting colonists].

So, in the month in which the United States came into existence, Congress asserted national jurisdiction over the seashore *between high and low tide*. What men sponsored this spoliation of the sacred rights of the 20-day-old states? John Adams of Massachusetts, Benjamin Harrison of Virginia and Robert Morris of Pennsylvania were the villains who drafted it.

Surely the infant states rebelled at this series of federal laws, by which Congress thrust its long nose into the baby carriage of state sovereignty. Alas no. Read the resolution adopted by the Virginia Committee of Safety on May 10, 1776:

Pursuant to POWERS RECEIVED FROM THE HONORABLE THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS, the Committee of Safety are ready to grant commissions for making reprisals upon the property of the people of Great Britain at sea, OR IN THE RIVERS BELOW HIGH-WATER MARK, to any persons who shall apply for them and comply with the terms mentioned by Congress.

Federal maritime jurisdiction, as Virginia saw it in 1776, extended above the present site of Washington, D. C., on the Potomac, and up to Fredericksburg on the Rappahannock—as far inland as the tides were felt.

In the ensuing war years, some continental privateersmen grew so enthusiastic that they went ashore in regions occupied by the British, and carried off cows and chickens belonging to American farmers. This was too much for Governor Clinton of New York, and too much for Congress. On Clinton's complaint, a Congressional committee on October 11, 1781, brought in this resolve:

That whereas . . . citizens of these United States . . . have been plundered of their property ABOVE HIGH-WATER MARK under the pretence of legal authority . . . therefore resolved, that no goods taken ON LAND ABOVE HIGH-WATER MARK shall be deemed legal prize within the United States.

There you have it. National sovereignty over ocean waters, in the days of the Founding Fathers, did not extend *above high tide*. The man who wrote this, Samuel Livermore of New Hampshire, knew his salt water. He resigned from Congress a few months later to become a judge of the Court of Appeals in Cases of Capture.

James Madison, who later had something to do with writing the Constitution, was in the Continental Congress at this time. Nobody was more zealous in defending the "historic rights of the states" to the ocean *above high tide*. In a new ordinance regulating captures, he wrote to Edmund Pendleton on January 8, 1782, a clause was inserted authorizing the capture of British merchandise, owned by neutrals, "if coming into these states, and WITHIN THREE LEAGUES of the coast."

Congress, he added, "have now recommended to the states to subject them to seizure, during the war, IF FOUND ON LAND within their respective limits." There you have the Father of the Constitution dividing state and federal spheres. State sovereignty was to be exercised *on land*, federal sovereignty from the water's edge to nine miles out.

But suppose a ship ran aground. Who had jurisdiction in that case? Well, that question was before Congress at the time Madison wrote. The British captured a vessel in coastal waters and ran it onto a bar. Deserted by its prize crew, did it belong to its owners or to the armed squad of Americans that went aboard. A committee of Congress undertook to settle it with this amendment to the ordinance Madison was talking about:

And it is further ordained, that where vessels . . . sailing or being within the body of a county, or within any river arm of the sea, or within cannon shot of the shore of any of these states . . . shall be captured by the enemy, and shall be recaptured BELOW HIGH-WATER MARK . . . [salvage only shall be paid].

Here indeed was a horrendous invasion of the oil-company interpretation of state rights. This time there was a revolt. Madison and Randolph of Virginia led a band which defeated the measure and forced a rewriting of it. They inserted a clause, "laden with the produce of the enemy," and passed it without a qualm.

After reading this record, will the oil men in Congress still insist on being guided by "the historic rights of the states"? The clear, undeniable fact is that in 1776, and all through the Revolutionary War, *high tide* was the dividing line between state and federal sovereignty. The Founding Fathers went farther than the Supreme Court

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in affirming national jurisdiction—they included the actual tidelands, the area between high and low water, in the federal realm.

Of course, this does not prevent Congress from voting to abandon national sovereignty in order to give away the people's property. However, before they come to a final roll call, they might find it worth while to read the report of a committee of the Continental Congress, submitted on February 2, 1779, on "the supreme control" of the United States "over the several [state] jurisdictions" in maritime matters:

> That this control is necessary in order to compel a just and uniform execution of the law of nations, and being essential to the supreme sovereign power of war and peace, THE CONGRESS COULD NOT DIVEST THEMSELVES OF IT.

That report dealt with the sloop *Active*, owned by Gideon Olmstead. It marked the beginning of the famous *Olmstead Case*, in which, as any state rights lawyer will tell you, the Supreme Court knocked the whey out of the constitutional rights of the states.

The report was written by Thomas Burke of North Carolina, who, as any historian will tell you, was the most extreme State Righter who ever sat in the Continental Congress.

LIGHTS OUT—POWER OFF!

IV. SEASON FOR PLUNDER

by K. W. Hamilton

ELECTRIC POWER is one of the basic ingredients of the nation's industrial and economic welfare. As the President's Materials Policy Commission said in its report last year, "Shortages of electricity and rising real costs would impede economic growth; they could throttle national effort in event of war." Losses in production and incomes resulting from power shortages during the last 10 years support this statement.

On the farm and in the factory kilowatts increasingly take the place of manpower. The growth of the economy, the industrial shift to more energy-consuming processes, prospects of a continuing tight labor market, and the exodus of young people from the farms contribute to the need for more power. The United States generating capacity to meet this need must expand two and one-half times by 1975, according to PMPC.

To harness resources and provide low-cost power for economic expansion, the government during the last two decades has constructed a vast hydroelectric plant. These facilities have become the solid foundations for the economic progress of the Tennessee Valley and the Pacific Northwest; they have permitted the establishment of the atomic energy plants and of the aluminum industry in those areas.

The private utilities from the very beginning have opposed and obstructed the construction of government power plants. They feared the threat to their monopolistic rate structures. For 20 years the utilities have told the people that power was plentiful; that jackrabbits would be the only customers for Grand Coulee power, for instance; that the farmers had all the power they wanted back in 1935—when only 10.9 percent of farms were electrified, and when farmers used only a small fraction of the power they now consume. (Farm consumption multiplied 4.5 times during the period 1942-52 alone.)

Only threat or special financial inducement have occasionally dislodged private utilities from their scarcity policies.

Continued economic growth is at stake. But currently we are faced with an accelerated campaign by the private power companies to turn the lights out at a time when there are few friends of public power left in Washington.

The new Administration has shown little realization that (1) an investment in natural resources now will reduce waste and erosion and yield large dividends in goods produced, income opportunities created, and taxes paid or that (2) many of the programs initiated during the last 20 years pay for themselves in power revenues and in repayments on REA loans. Its leaders do not seem to count the losses of water running unutilized to the sea; of soil washed down the river; of farm land flooded; of food spoiled due to lack of refrigeration. Their concern is to balance the budget of cash rather than that of resources.

The current campaign of the private utility companies is three-pronged in method and objective. Its instruments are the Administration, the legislatures and the courts; its objectives, the elimination of government construction and ownership of municipal power systems and of REA co-ops.

In the Administration, the three agencies most concerned with power are the Interior Department; the Rural Electrification Administration and the Federal Power Commission. From the President on down through the new hierarchy in Interior and REA, the climate has changed to cloudy and cooler. New appointees to the FPC will surely cause the barometer to drop there, too.

K. W. Hamilton is the pseudonym for a Washington writer who has covered resources problems extensively.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ridiculing federal power during the campaign, President Eisenhower said: "The government will build the power dams, the government will tell you how to distribute your power, the government will do this and that, the government does everything but come in and wash the dishes for the housewife." The new Secretary of Interior, Douglas McKay, as former Governor of Oregon, brings positive convictions about multipurpose development of water resources. But his position is unclear on basic elements of public power policy: on the preference clause, which assures adequate participation to municipalities and co-operatives, and on the construction of transmission lines which gives effect to the preference policy. He opposes valley authorities.

Fred G. Aandahl, of North Dakota, another ex-Governor, is in charge of water and power in Interior. Proclaiming himself a "strong supporter of the states' rights philosophy," he supports the preference clause *but* does not think "that transmission lines should reach out beyond distances of economic feasibility just to reach priority customers." Steam plants to supplement the hydroelectric power, he feels, would mean "we are just going to move further and further in the direction of complete nationalization of electric power" (see *NR*, 3/23/53, p. 15). (In 1951 the federal government generated less than 12 percent of all power in the US.)

The new solicitor also hastened to declare that he was "pretty lukewarm toward the idea of the super imposition of federal authority over the Missouri Basin."

Ralph Tudor, the new Under-Secretary of Interior left Senators wondering whether his previous associations with the Army Corps of Engineers had infected him with its notoriously narrow thinking.

Orme Lewis of Arizona is the new Assistant Secretary in charge of Public Lands and Indian Affairs. Before he could be confirmed, he first had to divest himself of stock in the Arizona Power Company which holds contracts with these agencies.

Currently at work in the Department, at the behest of Chairman John Taber (R, N. Y.) of the House Appropriations Committee, is Leslie Miller, ex-Governor of Wyoming, long a foe of valley authorities and public power. He is looking over the Interior budget to find which "unnecessary" items can be eliminated.

The REA, second of the three powerful agencies, was set up in 1935 as an independent, non-political organization to help farmers electrify their farms through low-interest loans and technical assistance. REA Administrator Claude Wickard, whose term still had over two years to go, received his walking papers last month from Agriculture Secretary Ezra Taft Benson. Since Wickard took office in 1945, the miles of rural power lines have tripled, the number of the REA customers, more than doubled.

Now more than one-half million farms remain to be connected; established systems require "heavying up" to sustain increasing loads. REA loans will also be needed to generate and transmit power in those areas where private utilities propose exorbitant wholesale rates or excessive charges to connect co-op systems.

The newly appointed REA Administrator, Lt.-Gov. Ancher Nelsen of Minnesota, has been reported as opposed to the preference clause and lukewarm to generation and transmission loans. Without these loans co-ops are at the mercy of private utilities. Even before Wickard's departure, the Administration's budget drive had in effect deprived the REA of $47 million in loan authority for the first half of 1953.

Other agencies enter the act. Defense Secretary Charles E. Wilson cut out the request for Table Rock Dam, the only power project to receive Congressional approval last year—not a single transmission line passed. Now, even that dam is being scuttled. It would have furnished power for the REA co-ops, which had given up their contracted supply of power from another dam, so that a new defense plant could begin operations. The co-ops had been promised Table Rock Dam power in exchange. Now the Army is defaulting and the co-ops in a four-state area will be without power to meet their growing demands.

When they reach the legislature, whatever budget requests finally emerge from the Administration will have opposition from tax-cut-minded Congressmen. Private utilities will represent the election results as a mandate to abolish "Socialism." In the absence of the perseverance Administration leaders showed in former years, more items will drop out. Congressmen will not calculate the waste incident to halting or delaying projects already under way.

The campaign on Capitol Hill will follow the well-worn course: first, opposition to authorization of new projects; failing that, opposition to appropriations for the dam; then for the power house; then for the transmission lines and substations; then for steam plants to firm up power and return greater revenue. Some legislators will make fine speeches about conservation and utilization of resources. Few will suit action to oratory.

Relatively new in the utilities' campaign is the help of the courts. Recent examples range from an injunction against the municipal power system of a village (pop. 1,910) in Michigan which wanted to add a diesel engine (1,600 hp.); to a Supreme Court decision involving the multimillion Roanoke Rapids project.

In that case, the FPC had licensed the Virginia Electric Power Company to build a power plant on the Roa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

noke River. Congress, in 1944, had "adopted and authorized" a comprehensive development plan for the entire river basin, eventually to include 11 dams, two of which the government has constructed. Interior asked for a review of the FPC action, claiming that Congress had precluded private construction in the Roanoke Basin. The Roanoke Rapids site is the most profitable of the 11. Kerr Dam, already completed, adds $700,000 worth annually to Roanoke Rapids capacity. In his dissent, Justice William O. Douglas called the case a "raid on the public domain." To him, and Justices Vinson and Black, it seemed "almost too plain for argument that Congress, in approving the plan for the development of the Roanoke River Basin, was setting it aside for federal development. . . . There is not a word in the [Flood Control] Act which allows such an unconscionable appropriation of the public domain by private interests. To infer that Congress sanctioned such a scheme is to assume it was utterly reckless with the public domain." In the majority opinion Justice Frankfurter does not decide "which agency—the government or a private party —should construct this project." He merely declared Roanoke Rapids available for private development.

The case cannot be hailed as a broad victory for private power, but it may have wide repercussions. Two other projects involve similar questions: Pacific Gas and Electric Company has received an FPC license for a plant on the Kings River in California. Interior intervened; and the case is pending in court. Also affected may be "the biggest hole in the world," Hells Canyon, in Washington. Idaho Power Company has applied for permission to construct a dam which would generate far less power and provide far less water storage than the dam proposed by the Reclamation Bureau. The FPC hearings in this matter begin May 13. Ex-President Harry Truman had twice requested authorization to construct this project which is of utmost importance to the power-short Northwest. However, Congress has not yet acted.

Other court actions, initiated by private power companies, seek to hamstring the REA co-ops and their integration with Interior's power-marketing agencies. In Arkansas, the State Supreme Court has reversed the Public Service Commission which had permitted a co-op to construct a steam plant and transmission lines to pool power with Interior.

Ten private utilities of Missouri seek to enjoin former Secretaries Oscar Chapman and Charles Brannan from entering a similar arrangement in that state. The case is pending in district court.

Two power companies in South Carolina obtained an injunction against Southeastern Power Administration which wanted to construct a 41-mile transmission line from the new Clark Hill Dam. Even though it found the companies not sufficiently affected to have a standing in court, the Georgia district court granted the injunction. Before it had acted, to make doubly sure, Sen. Guy Cordon (R, Ore.) requested the Comptroller General of the US to rule on the availability of the SEPA funds for this purpose. The Comptroller ruled against the SEPA. Chapman appealed in vain.

The importance of the SEPA's ability to construct lines becomes clear from its current negotiations in another area, for which Congress had not appropriated money. Following a Congressional mandate to negotiate a wheeling agreement with the Georgia Power Company, the SEPA encountered a proposal from the company to purchase all Clark Hill Dam power at the bus bar, and then to sell it without safeguards for statutory preference customers. Just before he left office, Chapman strongly denounced the proposal as contrary to Congressional intent. If the SEPA had money to construct its own lines, it would find Georgia Power far more reasonable in negotiating.

In Kentucky, a court held that a co-op could build a steam plant, but not transmission lines to carry the power to consumers; not even the private utility which had brought the suit was satisfied with that.

The legal harassment becomes a little rough when a private utility after failing to accomplish its objective through a barrage of advertisements, goes into court to enjoin the city council of that Michigan village from installing one little diesel engine to meet a growing power need. It becomes a little extra-legal, when a private utility in Connecticut threatens to cut off the water supply of a whole town, unless that town sells its municipal power system to the utility.

The great danger in this internecine strife is that it diverts attention from the main issue: the installation and distribution of great quantities of low-cost generating capacity to sustain the steady growth of the economy.

Every commission which has spoken and reported on the subject of water and power policy and natural resources during the past decades has urged the adoption of an integrated approach. It is too bad that once a project is proposed for actual construction, it begins the tortuous course of agency-to-budget bureau-to-House-to-Senate all alone, wrenched out of comprehensive context, unchaperoned by the steadying influence of integrated policy. Alone it runs the gauntlet of "Socialism," economy, local pork-barreling, horse trading; and the maelstrom of conflicts tosses it around until—even if it comes out unscathed—it bears little resemblance to resources policy of which it is part.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LITERATURE AND THE ARTS

THE HIGHER METEOROLOGY OF SAINT-JOHN PERSE

by Kathleen Raine

FROM HER voyages of exploration and her imperialism, England has not been proportionately enriched in works of the imagination. *The Ancient Mariner*, Darwin's theory of Evolution, the poems of Edward Lear, are great exceptions. From the long occupation of India, Kipling is the only writer to be remembered; from French imperialism, the enrichment has been, if not more brilliant, more constant; one thinks of Chateaubriand, the Flaubert of *Salammbo*, of Rimbaud, Gauguin and the Douanier Rousseau. Saint-John Perse stands nearest, perhaps, to Gauguin; yet even so, he has neither visible antecedents nor followers, but stands in proud solitude, outside any literary school or tradition. Archibald MacLeish, in an article on Perse's poem *Exile* wisely confined himself to discussing the non-literary sources of Perse's poetry, and in a long memoir by Alain Bosquet, the same fact clearly emerges—the art of letters is the wrong handle by which to take hold of this poetry, better to be understood by studying wind and tide, the morphology of plant and animal, than by the study of literary sources. In its essence, in spite of great superficial sophistication and all it may owe to Pindar or Xenophon, this is primitive poetry, in the sense in which Whitman, Conrad and D. H. Lawrence are primitive. In Saint-John Perse, exoticism is not a sophistication, but an innocence, a memory of childhood. I know of no other poet who has surveyed civilization at its greatest complexity with eyes that have first understood the substrata upon which human societies form so thin a layer of the crust of time. Only in India could one find a comparable range of barbarity and culture existing simultaneously, and by the same vital impulse.

WINDS, by Saint-John Perse, translated by Hugh Chisholm (Bollingen Series: Pantheon; $5).

The poet's range of allusion takes in many civilizations but not their literature, language and thought so much as those artifices and artifacts that, like shells and fossils, bear witness to the passage of natural life. It is not human thought, but human life that interests Saint-John Perse, and it is no accident that has brought him to America, the growing-point of man's natural history.

Alain Bosquet rightly says that, before everything else, it is "the slow serene unfolding of the enjambed stanza, its solemn movement, vibrant yet firm" that distinguishes these poems. It is rash to speculate on the technicalities of a language other than one's own; but it is notable that no successful prose-poem has been written in English (unless it is *Finnegans Wake* or David Jones' *In Parenthesis*). This does not seem to hold good in the French language. Perhaps the English Bible, and in particular the psalms, has made prose-poetry of comparable splendor something not to be attempted. It is significant that Joyce, who alone has used with supreme mastery prose rhythms exalted to poetic intensity, did not, as a Catholic Irishman inherit those psalm-cadences. It may well be that in French the exploration of prose rhythms, from Rimbaud to Claudel and Perse represents a real development in the language that has no parallel in modern English. There is, certainly, little affinity between the rhetoric of Saint-John Perse that seems to arise from a ground of prose, and the free verse of his first English translator, T. S. Eliot, or of Ezra Pound, that comes, rather, from a breaking-up of strict verse-forms. M. Bosquet claims that Perse translates well; and in a sense this is so, for it is by the juxtaposition less of words than of images that his most characteristic discords and harmonies (comparable to the use of color by Gauguin or Matisse) are obtained—and he has been translated into many languages. Yet, in another sense, Perse is an untranslatable poet, because his rhythmic discoveries have a significance in French that they cannot have in any other language. Significantly, T. S. Eliot, meticulous in his rendering of Perse's exact and recondite vocabulary, loses much of the wave-beat and wing-beat of his cadences; of his English translators, Denis Devlin, an Irishman, has best captured the rhythmical quality of the poems. In this respect Mr. Hugh Chisholm is less successful; and one could carp also at imprecisions (like *lactaries* instead of *lactarias*—a common genus of fungi) which often suggest that the image is a mere piece of preciosity, whereas here, as always, the poet's observation is minute and correct like that of a naturalist or an archaeologist. It is an adequate, but certainly not a first-class translation; nor are the articles at the end first-class criticism, but vague laudations from Claudel and less distinguished names. A good editorial introduction would have been better. The production is sumptuous, almost too much so, the typography irreproachable. Indeed *Exile* was just manageable, but *Winds*, with a hundred pages more, is too heavy as well as too large to read, as I should like to read it—at the edge of the sea or the desert, or in an open boat with a single sail. These volumes belong in fact to a world very remote from the sources of his poetry.

These poems wash up with their waves, or bear upon their branches, the artifacts of civilizations of Asia from Phoenicia to the Gobi Desert, of Mongolia, of the Andes, the West Indies, and along with them and newest in succession, modern America; but there is no difference between what is created by man and what is created by nature. The green locust, the spores of fern and fungi, the fruits of strange tropical vegetation do not differ in kind from the golden bracelets, the sacrificial vessels, ancient weapons and modern machines

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that man makes. Supreme pantheist, the poet sees all the works of man as magnificent leaves and flowers on the one tree of life. Man is not the opposite of nature, but part of nature—a nature so splendid as to dazzle us and compel our idolatry—Vala's shimmering veil. The process of nature—the Buddhist *Samskara* had no beginning, has no end; destruction and creation are not opposite, but one unbroken, perpetual process, like the turning of the earth or the blowing of the four winds, a great outpouring of life, like the religion of Siva, or of those Aztec gods whose symbols of fertility are likewise encircled with necklaces of skulls. It is a poetry without formal limits, expressing a process that has no point of rest. In that natural religion, man can return to no beginning, nor reach any final end; species and races are forever in migration, moving perpetually into a future that is not different from the past, yet always different.

***Winds,* perhaps** the finest of the poems, has been described as an epic. This word might perhaps be applicable to *Anabase,* whose nameless hero is both human and noble; but *Winds* has no hero but the spirit that animates and blows where it listeth, and its four sections, each divided into a number of strophic sections might more justly be called hymns, since the theme is divine rather than human, the evocation and praise of the pantheistic god, the animating spirit of the universe. One thinks rather of the Vedic than the Homeric hymns, both because of the rich proliferation of detail, and because the spirit is a dynamic conception, very unlike the Greek idea of an imaginative order. "Nature has no outline but imagination has"; and in the sense in which Blake here uses the word, Perse is celebrating a natural and not an imaginative order: he is a pagan. But by no poet have the nature-gods been more magnificently praised. By accepting exile, mutuality and dispossession as man's natural condition, Saint-John Perse has attained a vision of ecstatic joy in the face of death and destruction—a vision lost to our world for centuries, and in these poems reaffirmed.

INTERNATIONAL LETTERS

BOTTEGHE OSCURE X (Farrar, Straus and Young; $2).

FOR FIVE YEARS, in every spring and fall, *Botteghe Oscure* has been issued from the street of that name in Rome, from the house, the Palazzo Caetani, that dominates that street. And if it is a Street of Dark Shops, this among its products is a brilliant beacon on the European literary scene, for in five years *Botteghe Oscure* has firmly established itself as the most important review in Europe. Devoted entirely to imaginative writing and comprising three languages and four nationalities (Italian, French, British, and American), it is the result of the selfless devotion to modern letters of its owner and editor, the American-born Princess Marguerite Caetani. It is entirely fitting (if rather late) that the tenth number of *Botteghe Oscure,* a kind of anniversary issue should have found an American distributor, the enterprising and enlightened firm of Farrar, Straus, and Young, who will in the future make this remarkable periodical, which has never advertised itself and has had such enormous influence, as available to Americans as, for five years, it has been to Europeans.

The intention of *Botteghe Oscure* has been to find an audience for all that is best in contemporary writing; further, to place the most promising new writers beside the most exciting established writers; further, to cut across national limits and give us these enlightening international juxtapositions; and finally, to present the best and perhaps even the highly acclaimed writers of one of the four countries when they are not well-known in two or three of the others. Thus, in the past, Marguerite Caetani has published such well-known figures as Silone and Valéry, Edith Sitwell and Marianne Moore, but she has also published the work of about sixty-five young writers who had not appeared in print before. The result is a kind of international service, for of these hitherto unknown younger writers, an astonishing number have now been translated and published abroad—if French or Italian, into English; if English or American, into French and Italian. One hopes that, with a wider distribution than this review has until now enjoyed in the United States, many more of these young Europeans will find translators and publication there, and that Europe, correspondingly, will be enriched by our considerably brilliant if still unestablished young writers.

Number Ten is rather different from its predecessors in that, because it is a birthday present to us all, it devotes nearly all of its four hundred and seventy-nine handsomely printed pages to little-known writers. One of the few exceptions demonstrates the way in which Marguerite Caetani pursues her purpose. René Char, it is now generally agreed among all but Existentialist writers in France, is the most important living French poet. His work has appeared in past numbers of *Botteghe Oscure*, but in the current issue, a large selection of his poems appears not only in the French but in an excellent translation made by Denis Devlin, the Irish poet and Minister in Rome, and Jackson Mathews, the American professor of French in the University of Washington. So highly esteemed in his own country, so reasonably well-known in Italy, M. Char has, until now, been almost totally unknown in both England and the United States; but the immediate result of the excitement attendant upon this publication in translation is that his poems will presently be published in both those countries, and a merely national, or provincial reputation will become an international reputation.

The selections from René Char are the best of the work from France in Number Ten. Different both from Eliot in England and the Existentialists in France, M. Char is working another poetic vein, a new one in present day literary Europe, and a vein that we all badly need to have worked. Raised among peasants, René Char was a *maquisard* in the war and now earns his living by making concrete building blocks. His poetry, whether in verse or prose, is aphoristic without being abstract, sometimes a little in the manner of the Blake of the *Proverbs of Hell* (*"Si nous habitons un éclair, il est le coeur de l'éternel"*: "If we live in a lightning flash, it is the heart of eternity."): philosophic, even gnomic, passionately publishing the good news that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man even in a mechanized age is not a mechanism but an individual being, and that human nature lives in fiery intimacy within nature at large, humbly or grandly as it may present itself. The view is perhaps not unlike that of Dylan Thomas' (another frequent contributor to *Botteghe Oscure*), but, untortured by the paradoxes of Christianity, M. Char's manner is beautifully poised, externalized and classic, at the same time that it is always concerned with the profoundest internalities.

Rene Char serves, perhaps, to underline the chief difference between the contributions from France and Italy and those from England and America. The Continentals have a way of achieving a simplicity of syntax and diction that, without in any way sacrificing the moral and psychological complexities with which they are concerned, always leaves the writer firmly in control of his subject; the Americans in general, and the British, too, although less so, seem to write with an almost compulsive, sometimes hysterical rush and involution of word, image, and sentence that almost suggests that the subject controls them. The contrast between the most impressive Italian selection in Number Ten and the most impressive American contribution is a contrast that, roughly, characterizes the whole volume.

The two pieces that I have in mind are a long short story by Silvio D'Arzo called *Casa D'Altri* ("The House of Others"), and "The Opium Lady" by Marguerite Young, which is apparently a set-piece from her forthcoming novel, *Miss MacIntosh, My Darling*. Silvio D'Arzo is one of a number of pseudonymns invoked by the brilliant young Italian named Raffaele Comparoni who published his first volume at fifteen (in 1935) and died at thirty-two (in 1952), to the great loss of all letters. His story is set in the Apennines, and the hero is a country priest, and the entire ambience of the story is the commonplace; but out of this, as out of Flaubert's *A Simple Heart*, the gaunt and passionate lineaments of classic tragedy are wrung. Marguerite Young is the American poetess and author of that extraordinary essay in cranky American religious belief called *Angel in the Forest*. The long selection from her novel is one of the most remarkably sustained feats of morbid fantasy that has ever been published, and as one reads, one can simply, one can only wonder how she can go on for another page, another paragraph, with this incredible (if it were not there before you) fountain of the imagery that floats and flits and charges through a mind perpetually deranged by dope. One also feels, not at all paradoxically, that Miss Young could not have written this piece if she had not had her experience of Italy, for while the opium lady's house stands somewhere on the New England seacoast, the imagination that has created it has been drenched in the Italian—in the Roman—baroque, to which the Italians themselves are so impervious. And here, it would seem, we have something of a point in the contrast between the two writers, the two forms of imagination: the disciplined European imagination that lives among its traditional wonders (and horrors) with the same imperviousness with which it lives in its religion, which is simply another part of the whole life of feeling, and so is able to deal with the simplest subject simply, assuming always their complexity; and the more naïve American imagination, that sees everything freshly, and becomes a little overwrought by each new experience of vision and of feeling, and then writes with such brilliant compulsion, finding everywhere new complexities that challenge all the conventions of the simply written word.

I have mentioned only a few of the contributions to Number Ten of *Botteghe Oscure*, but I hope that I have indicated the kind of service that this beautifully produced, sensitively edited review can afford Americans now that it is going to be easily available: bring living Europe to us, bring our lives to Europe, show us how we are different, show us where we are alike. *Botteghe Oscure* is one of the few functioning international efforts in an age when everyone is proposing international efforts.

MARK SCHORER

Mr. Schorer is writing from Italy. At present, he is in Florence, working on a new novel, while on leave of absence from the University of California, Berkeley.

THE TROPIC FRONT

NATIONALISM AND REVOLUTION IN INDONESIA, by George M. Kahin (Cornell; $6).

QUITE A NUMBER OF BOOKS since the war have tried to explain the revolutionary tide in Southeast Asia. Most of them lack in perspective. First-hand knowledge of events is, of course, an asset; but too often accounts of passing incidents, of leading personalities, of shifts in party strategy, take the place of analysis. The present work is, in the main, a fresh and judicious re-examination of well-known sources. The chapters based on the author's own observations, in 1948-49, are the least interesting.

We have been too dependent on Dutch sources to get a clear view of indigenous political behavior. The facts are reported reliably enough; but as outsiders begin to peer more insistently into the recesses of Indonesian history, it becomes apparent that the colonial chroniclers—even when critics of their home government—often have misunderstood or failed to recognize significant social trends. For example, there has been much talk of the survival of democratic institutions in village life. Mr. Kahin brings out that these were all but destroyed during the European regime, and that the nationalism of the twentieth century has few functional connections with the past.

Although conditions of life have improved since the turn of the century, larger contacts with the outside world and increased mechanization of production have made for a sense of oppression. To cheapen the civil service and non-manual operations in trade and industry, the colonial government brought back to life the very indigenous middle class which for centuries it had been at pains to suppress. But, as the French also have learned in Indochina, it is no longer possible to channel the rising self-assertion of an awakened intelligentsia into hatred of the alien Asian usurper of its rights, and to bind it to the interests of the metropolitan power. Sooner or later, the educated, influential far beyond their number or economic strength, make common cause with peasants and wage-earners. That subsequently they tend to divide again—surprisingly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

often on abstract principle and not on obvious class lines—does not lessen the impact of the combined forces. The role played by modern Islamic teaching in the forging of national unity has rarely been so well documented.

These are but samples of many convincing revaluations. The sweeping power of the work cannot be illustrated. Current Indonesian politics can be correctly judged only with such awareness of historical factors as it affords. Even readers concerned only with the present situation will here find enlightenment on baffling elements in the Republic's political orientation. They may be interested to know that Mr. Kahin has brought this account yet closer to this day in his contribution to a symposium called *Asian Nationalism and the West*. Both works are sponsored by the Institute of Pacific Relations.

BRUNO LASKER

A MIND IN CHAINS

GIANT IN CHAINS, by Barrows Dunham (Little, Brown; $3.75).

BOOKS BY PROFESSIONAL philosophers in our day are so technical that they can be read only by specialists. An original philosophical work written for the general reader, inviting a widespread discussion of ideas, might be of immense value. Mr. Dunham's book seems to be an attempt of this sort, but even casual scrutiny reveals it as part of a small, undistinguished tradition of popular philosophical writing intended to persuade the layman of the ultimate incompetence of professional philosophers and the necessary truth of Marxism.

Giant in Chains develops a philosophy that is a personal version of Marxism. It deals with alternative theories incidentally, to discredit them. More interesting than Mr. Dunham's argument is his technique of persuasion: he alternately flatters and deceives the reader, pretending great admiration for the giants of philosophy, only to heighten disappointment with their results.

The book has a certain warmth, a surface reasonableness, a do-good atmosphere, and it is written in simple journalese. The occasional distinction of the style is due to the paraphrase, without credits, of wittier men. "The life of the intellect," he says, "is too serious a thing to be left to the intellectuals." (*Cf.* Clemenceau on war and generals.) "In the nineteenth century . . . clarity was the hobgoblin of little minds." (*Cf.* Emerson on consistency; although Mr. Dunham writes Emerson off as a pale version of Carlyle and describes Carlyle as a man whose eminence depended on a claim to read German.)

A few quotations should be of interest. Pragmatists are characterized as people "who think [philosophy] is a technique for quick profits." Enormous problems are settled in a few words. "Politics rules everything except economics, and economics rules politics. . . . Throughout past ages, philosophy has been partly what philosophers wanted it to be, but mostly what rulers permitted it to be." Philosophical howlers are scattered about in casual phrases. "When Protagoras, on behalf of a self-assertive ethics, wished to undermine the whole system of custom and use. . . . " Every elementary student of the history of philosophy learns that the great issue between Socrates and Protagoras was that Socrates based his ethics on nature (physis) and Protagoras based his on custom and use (nomos).

Other theories are liquidated with the greatest of ease. Cultural relativism is wrong because, although there is obviously a relativity of means, there is also in fact a community of ends. Kant's interest in method is described in economic terms as the producer's point of view, obviously inadequate because there are consumers too. Mr. Dunham deals sharply with contemporary interest in method. "In its more intellectual forms it becomes casuistry, and in Dewey's instrumentalism it shows the American taste for gadgets." Relativism per se is refuted by applying it to itself. And if all statements are relative, how about the statement that all statements are relative? A paradox, to be sure, and the self-same paradox which exists when one applies Hegel's doctrine to itself or, alas, Marx's theory to Marxism.

Mr. Dunham even has a universally valid moral ideal: "that organization of mankind in which the satisfaction of human needs occurs with complete efficiency." There is no point in calling this statement ambiguous; it is too vague for that. And Mr. Dunham attempts no clarification. But he does defend it, whatever it means, as easily as he does everything else. To deny it, he maintains, "is to make the separation of theory from practice complete and final." He suggests that the union of theory and practice is so complete that to deny it is to utter a contradiction. Then, if the denial of this moral ideal implies a contradiction, the ideal must be what is sometimes called a necessary proposition. Mr. Dunham is not disturbed by any realization that necessary propositions are not empirical, and that they give us only formal guidance.

I take it the title refers to the common man—who is also the reader—as a giant; the chains are derived perhaps from the opening sentence of the first chapter of Rousseau's *Social Contract*, perhaps from the penultimate paragraph of the *Communist Manifesto*. Flattery of the reader as common man goes hand in hand with instruction, partly instruction in his own worth. The common man, Mr. Dunham argues, is a social scientist of sorts because he lives in society, and a natural scientist because he lives in nature. He is also a philosopher who can do better in one way than professionals: theirs for the most part is a "philosophy of accommodation," i.e., accommodation of ideas to the safety of the philosopher. So the common man only needs courage and he can see immediately, with Mr. Dunham, that "the natural sciences say that they have nothing to do with politics—an illusion which not even the hydrogen bomb seems able to explode. And the social sciences, in terror of harboring dangerous knowledge, are beginning to talk as if they had no knowledge at all." As for philosophy, "if the positivists and pragmatists continue to identify philosophy with the fragments they have of it, the rest of mankind, who possess the whole garment, can afford to chuckle in their own totalitarian wealth." What Mr. Dunham never says explicitly is here implicit: "totalitarian" is used instead of "total," and is obviously an honorific adjective.

RALPH G. ROSS

Professor Ross teaches in the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Minnesota.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WITH THUMB INDEX

WEBSTER'S NEW WORLD DICTIONARY, College Edition (World; $5, $6 with thumb index).

DICTIONARY A *(Webster's New World Dictionary)* is bulkiest and heaviest; and it claims most pages and most entries, though long division shows that C (*The American College Dictionary,* 1951) averages ten more entries per page and B *(Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary,* 1951) twenty more. The type in C is only slightly smaller. The text type in B is smallest, but greater contrast between fonts makes spotting entries and senses much the easiest.

The number of entries is not necessarily an indication of coverage, since presentations vary. Dictionaries A and C have one alphabetical listing; B has several. A alone has no "run-in" forms: *-ic* and *-ical* always become separate entries, though *-ly* and *-ness* forms do not automatically appear. Further, A has separate entries for *coupé* and *coupe*, *High-Church* and *High Church*, *sal soda* and *salsoda*. I tested three random pages for coverage against the same ranges in B and C. Equating differences of presentation and using A's maximal entry system, I found twelve more in B and eleven in C; using C's minimal entry system, two less in B and sixteen in C.

Another test for coverage is to check wide-ranging lists. Here both A and C perhaps discourage criticism by asserting that they have used frequency counts in compiling their basic word stock. No desk dictionary can be all-inclusive, and special emphases may promote sales. A deliberately includes more colloquial and slang expressions, and thus may be helpful to foreign-born and to high school students learning to criticize their vernacular. (Only A has *hot-rod*, *shaggy dog*, *socialize*, and *tootsie* "a child's or woman's small foot"). But is slang more important or American than *box canyon*, *freeway*, *funeral home*, *group dynamics*, *meander scar*, *symbolic logic*, *workshop* (as used by educators), or *or* in its weak sense (cream or sugar)? They appear in none of the three. A alone lacks *bound form*, *PX*, *expressway*, *higher criticism*. B lacks *cold front*, *mathematical logic*, *overdrive*, *speech clinic*. C lacks *Domei*, *polystyrene*, *rocket bomb*, *studio couch*.

The omission of standard words—not all recent—is a serious defect, and offsets the lists of striking inclusions to which publishers call attention. A and C are proud of their use of modern linguistics, but B contains more of the terminology of linguistic science. Of the seventeen "new scientific, business and social terms" advertized by A, "most of them not found in the other two," nine are in B, eight are in C—six are in both, five in B or C. Dictionary A indeed has unique standard words: *exploded view*, *domestic science*, *lemon drop*; C has *Deaconess* (P.E.), logical *implication*, *module* as standardization of building parts; B tested higher than either: well *core*, *Danish pastry*, *Walter Reuther*, Christian *seasons*.

Properly a definition can be clear and simple only after it is accurate; then fullness matters. B has a reputation for difficulty, but under *histidine* A has *hydrolysis;* under *clause* A has *hypotaxis*. Using a scale of three, I assessed 125 definitions in seven subject areas; B and C ranked equally first (in five to four ratio to A), and B ranked lowest least often; the composite ranking is B, C, A.

Dictionary A often fails to qualify sufficiently. Latin names for plants and animals are rare. Sumacs are "plants [!] with lance-shaped leaves [nothing about compound] and cone-shaped clusters of hairy, red fruit"; poison ivy is "any of several American sumacs with grayish berries." Book A shies away from relativism: of cactus C says, "chiefly natives of hot, dry regions"; A says, "grow in hot, arid parts"—and what did I bring home from Kentucky and Florida? Compare also *console*, *shamrock*. A avoids complexity and strain on the reader's mind: under *eclipse*, A has pictures of four stages but B and C have astronomical diagrams. Compare also *barometer*, *contour map*. The tendency of A is clearly lowbrow.

Under letters R and S, book C has twice as many illustrations and maps; B has fewest illustrations and no maps. The cuts in A are often (bazooka, Suez Canal) less detailed; sometimes (coronet, culvert) they are misleading; occasionally (circle, fingerprint, Rosetta stone) they seem to be quite pointless.

Although *Webster's New World Dictionary* "is *not* a revision of another dictionary," the present College Edition "is based upon and includes material from" the Encyclopedic Edition, published in 1951. Hence there has been time to catch the mistakes inevitable in a brand new book. But they weren't. (In the Table of Alphabets, German S is made out to be a variant of R. Of fifty pictures of animal life seven have no indication of size.) Harold Whitehall's excellent introductory essay on the English language explains that General American pronunciations are recorded in the book and instances *marry*, but the pronunciation for that entry (and for *carry*) is a different one. *Fungo*, a unique word, appears only as adjective (fungo bat), not as noun (hit fungos) or verb. *Bastard file*, also unique, is falsely defined as "a medium file, neither coarse nor fine." Whoever wrote the definition of *trap* rock should see the Columbia River lava flows. EDWARD CALVER

Dr. Calver, a linguistics scholar, is in charge of the freshman English courses at Wayne University in Detroit.

THE STYLE IS THE POEM

SPRING BIRTH AND OTHER POEMS, by Mark Van Doren (Holt; $3).

ONE READS the jacket-encomia with a certain amount of consternation. They range from: "It is time we all recognized that Mark Van Doren is one of the best American poets now writing" (David Daiches), through: [He], of living poets, is undoubtedly the one who is most representative of his nation and his time" (Howard Baker), to: "He is the only serious poet in this country who is able to apply constantly, without the unease of the social and historical mind, a single and remarkably pure sensibility to a medium that he is able to take on the whole for granted" (Allen Tate). Yet the actuality of these new poems reaffirms the impression made by the earlier work: that we have here a lyrist of considerable gifts, an ingenuous and frequently touching moralist, a philosopher of the school less homely than homey, a sensitive and delighted observer of na-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cure. This is much, but it is not major; to pretend to more is to do a disservice to a good craftsman.

That, I think, is the proper word. The great charm of Mr. Van Doren's poetry —for me, at any rate—is in the manner rather than the matter. *What* he says I find only occasionally compelling, as idea, as insight, as illumination. Images are often commonplace to the point of becoming shopworn; responses tend to drift out in a wash of Dickinsonian cuteness; or they are invested in a tone so simple as to verge on the false. "That God should love me is more wonderful/Than that I so imperfectly love him." Yes; but is this apparently plain proposition, really a proposition at all? On one level it can be read as a mild (and, of course, unconscious) blasphemy; on another, it seems little more than a button-holing kind of plainness that unnerves itself, the gospel-hymn plainness, in fact, suggested by the title of the sonnet from which it comes: "He Loves Me." Not that I wish to propose a general condemnation on the basis of two automatic lines from an indifferent sonnet. Indeed, there is so much good in the book that I have no desire to condemn at all. Simply, the lines are typical of the run of thought in these poems. They are not, however, typical of the style.

Let's alter the old wheeze to read *le style, c'est le poème.* This can be said of some charlatans, but not of many true poets. Mr. Van Doren is a true poet, yet I think that it applies to him. The thinness of *What* is redeemed here by the subtle virtuosity of *How.* The outstanding elegance is metrical. The ear is constantly delighted by intricate shiftings of cadence, by sonal interweaving and resolutions—by the music, in short. To this must be added the elegance of tone, which, at its best, is at once tender and drily ironic. So:

> Andromache, when Hector fell,
> Cried out upon her fate, not his.
> He lost but this one thing, the world;
> She gained its million miseries.
>
> Without him it was no more round
> And perfect, as pure death can be.
> A field of wry-shaped fragments wailed,
> Each one of them sharp-voiced as she.
>
> A wilderness of woes it was
> By which she measured, that long day,
> The quietness in his great throat
> That once held every dog away.

This poem, an excellent one, illustrates many of the virtues which I have suggested, and some of the deficiencies. I do not find in it the quality of "best", though most poets whom I know would be proud of it. No; but if Mr. Daiches, quoted above, would change his adjective to "better," I should be prepared to go along with him. DUDLEY FITTS

THE PROBLEM AGAIN

GERMANY PLOTS WITH THE KREMLIN, by T. H. Tetens (Schuman; $3.75).

IT HAS BEEN taken for granted in recent in recent years that Germany is our best friend in Europe. Is she though? Mr. Tetens, a lifelong student of German geo-politics and Pan-Germanism, thinks not, and says it in plain language. He states that the realities of the German question have not been thoroughly debated since VE days and never had close scrutiny either in Congress or in public debate.

That Mr. Tetens has spent quite a bit of time going through, painstakingly, German publications and that he has conducted his own Gallup poll on Germany's attitude toward America and Russia, is clearly seen from the numerous sources given in the book.

On the basis of his findings, Mr. Tetens arrives at the conclusion that the American people have been deceived about Germany's reliability as a bulwark against Russia.

That Germany plans to make a deal with Moscow has sufficient historical precedent, running all the way back to the days of Frederick the Great. It may be said by some that times have changed. Some optimists will point to Chancellor Adenauer as one who is devotedly Western in his ideas and a devout Catholic, who could not possibly double-cross the United States. However, religion or cultural inclinations have never hampered the policies of German Realpolitik. The German-Soviet Treaty of Rapallo in 1922, as Mr. Tetens points out, was engineered in part by a devout Catholic, ex-Chancellor Wirth. Incidentally, Dr. Wirth has made the news again through his recent friendly exchange of letters with the Soviet commander of the East Zone, General Chuikov. Mr. Tetens also shows that while Gustav Stresemann was a Westerner by cultural inclination, it was during his regime (1926) that a Neutrality Pact with the Soviets was signed which in effect, was a return to Bismarck's policy of friendly relations with the Russians.

Have times changed? Not according to Mr. Tetens, who quotes extensively from reliable German sources, including the leading German newspapers and politicians, all hinting about the future Soviet-German Bloc. For example, the mouthpiece of the Ruhr industrialists and also the Foriegn Office, the Frankfurter *Allgemeine Zeitung*, declared on March 15, 1952:

> [Russia] in order to jump out from her present isolation . . . can, exactly as the Rapallo Treaty did 30 years ago, place Germany as a protecting buffer between the East and the West. From the politico-economic point of view, she could repeat the old game for world power position by concluding long-term agreements with German industry and by renewing her trade with Germany. Thus, Russia might re-open the door to the world market.

Mr. Tetens knows whereof he speaks when he talks about the powerful economic interests of the Ruhr seeking by one means or another to regain their markets in the East. Didn't the Frankfurter *Allgemeine Zeitung* say on April 1, 1950, that they would address themselves to the "big boy in Moscow, instead of the little bosses in the East Zone," in order to make a deal with the Russians? JEAN PAJUS

LITERARY AGENCY

WRITERS! We have continual need for books, tv scripts, short stories, articles, dramas, etc. Write for terms TODAY! Mead Agency, 419 - 4th Avenue, New Lork 16, N. Y.

PERSONAL

DEPARTMENT STORE BLUES? Replenish your spring wardrobe at Miss Goodman's, **"where the individual is important."** Better dresses, suits, coats at sane prices. Expert alterations. Miss Goodman, 362 Lexington Avenue, near 41st Street. Murray Hill 5-0670.

MAGAZINE

"WHAT IS SEMANTICS?"—lead article in current issue of ETC., official quarterly journal of Int'l Society for General Semantics, edited by S. I. Hayakawa. Read how language forms limit thought, behavior. $4 year; trial issue $1. Write ETC., Dept. 22, 539 W. North Avenue, Chicago 10, Illinois.

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 201 N. ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

INFORMED? You Have A Stake In The Public Affairs Institute

WHAT IS PAI?

A non-profit, non-partisan, non-lobbying, tax-exempt research institution . . . on Capitol Hill in Washington . . . founded six years ago . . . a liberal-oriented, action research center . . . dubbed the "Poor Man's Brookings" . . . PAI experts work on live topics, present facts and conclusions in five major fields:

Natural Resources
Labor-Management Relations
Government Efficiency and Economy
Health and Welfare
International Relations

WHO ARE PAI EXPERTS?

They include: Dr. Dewey Anderson, executive director, one-time head of the well-known Temporary National Economic Committee "Monopoly Investigation," . . . Stephen Raushenbush, formerly industrial-relations director for Pennsylvania under Gov. Gifford Pinchot, leading authority on resource problems. . . . John Shott, formerly Wisconsin director of the National Labor Relations Board and senior economist of the Senate Small Business Committee. . . . Benton J. Stong, MVA committee head and former Farmers Union editor. . . . Alexander Uhl, former *PM* editorial writer and Associated Press European correspondent. . . . Will Lumer, economist. PAI pamphlet authors also include: Seymour Harris, Howard Mitchell, George Soule, Wallace Campbell, Ralph E. Tumer, Sen. Paul Douglas, Harry Conn, Herman Lazarus, Joseph Goldberg and Emily Brown.

YOU CAN PARTICIPATE

Sound research and facts are the basis of economic and social progress . . . PAI is devoted to this end . . . it also disseminates its findings. . . . PAI needs YOUR help in expanding this service . . . and you will find PAI publications invaluable source material. . . . If you want to know more about PAI fill out and send us this coupon.

HOW DOES PAI OPERATE?

Fact studies made for and disseminated to members of Congress, state governments, universities, teachers, researchers, newspapers and magazines, ministers, business and labor organizations and "opinion makers" . . . publishes memoranda, pamphlets, research papers, books and weekly newspaper column "Washington Window" . . . PAI pamphlet series, such as "Bold New Program," widely known and used . . . conducts discussions, holds conferences and consultations with leaders in American life.

WHO IS BEHIND PAI?

Sixty nationally known American leaders. Among original sponsors:

Morris L. Cook, first head of REA
Chester Bowles, Ex-Governor, Ambassador
Hubert H. Humphrey, US Senator, Minnesota
Charles E. Murray, Office of Sen. J. E. Murray
Prof. Arthur Schlesinger Jr., Harvard University
Stuart Chase, Author-Economist
Thurman Arnold, former Asst. US Attorney General
Fiorello H. LaGuardia, Late New York Mayor
W. P. Kennedy, Pres., Bro. RR Trainmen.
Morris Rosenthal, Businessman, Pres., Stein-Hall & Company
Prof. Theodore J. Kreps, Stanford University

PUBLIC AFFAIRS INSTITUTE,
Dewey Anderson and Associates,
312 Pennsylvania Ave., S.E.,
Washington 3, D.C.

Dear Sir:

I would like additional information on the work and publications of PAI.

Name .....

Address.....

City ..... Zone..... State .....

4-20-53

PUBLIC AFFAIRS INSTITUTE, 312 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., S.E., WASHINGTON 3, D.C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Fastest Growing Magazine in America—

THE *New Republic*—percentagewise—is the fastest growing national magazine in America. In the past six months its circulation has risen more than 50 percent. Today its circulation is 30 percent higher than the average for the entire 39 years of the magazine's existence.

WE EXPECTED *New Republic* circulation to rise during the 1952 campaign. Thousands of new readers turned to *New Republic* pages as an antidote to the one-party press. But what has surprised the magazine world is how the *New Republic* has kept on growing. It has done so because it fills a unique place in American journalism—there is no other magazine quite like it. Its readers' attachment to it is extraordinarily powerful. Because of the way in which it is edited, because its clear liberalism still shines like a good deed in a naughty world, because of the faith and hope of its readers, the *New Republic* today is more influential than ever before in its history.

NOW THE *New Republic* must stand on its own feet. In order to make its own way it must have *two* readers for every one it now has. A *New Republic* with a doubled circulation would still seem mighty small in a world of *Readers Digests* and *Lifes*, of *Saturday Evening Posts* and *Ladies' Home Journals*. But a *New Republic* with a doubled circulation not only would pay its own way, but would be infinitely stronger in its long battle to strengthen the forces of freedom, of liberalism and progress, in America and the world.

OUR READERS tell us that the *New Republic* does not need to be "sold"; it needs only to be introduced. Will you help us double the number of our readers by introducing us to someone you think needs a magazine like this? Or to as many such people as you can?

We have made it easy with the special offer below.

----------TEAR OFF HERE----------

20 WEEKS FOR $2.00 SPECIAL OFFER

THE NEW REPUBLIC
1416 F ST. N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.

For the enclosed $..... please send the *New Republic* for the next 20 weeks and the McCarthy reprint free to the following:

NAME.....
ADDRESS.....
CITY & ZONE..... STATE.....

NAME.....
ADDRESS.....
CITY & ZONE..... STATE.....

NAME.....
ADDRESS.....
CITY & ZONE..... STATE.....

NAME.....
ADDRESS.....
CITY & ZONE..... STATE.....

The Charles C. Sherrod Library
EAST TENNESSEE STATE COLLEGE
4-20-53
Johnson City, Tennessee

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED